

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/043,918	01/11/2002	Ramesh Pendakur	42390P11552	7242	
8791 BLAKELY SO	7590 06/03/200 DKOLOFF TAYLOR &	EXA	EXAMINER		
1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY			LI, GUANG W		
SUNNYVALI	E, CA 94085-4040		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2146	•	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			06/03/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/043,918	PENDAKUR, RAMESH	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Guang Li	2146	

	Guang Li	2146					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>08 May 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
<ol> <li>X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:</li> </ol>	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing							
<ul> <li>The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is</li> </ul>	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.				
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07		FIRST REPLY WAS FI	ED WITHIN TW				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.198(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checket. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL.	tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>							
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I</li> <li>They raise new issues that would require further control to the property of the property</li></ol>	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		cause				
<ul> <li>(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or</li> </ul>	ter form for appeal by materially rec	lucing or simplifying t	ne issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).							
<ol> <li>The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1.</li> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)</li> </ol>		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).				
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all		imely filed amendmer	it canceling the				
non-allowable claim(s).  7. To purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will	he entered and an e	colanation of				
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provi		Do ontoroa ana an o	pianation of				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to c showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar.	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appear and was not earlier presented. Se	and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a				
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> </ol>	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
13. Other:							
/Jeffrey Pwu/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2146							

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

## Applicant Arguments:

- A) Claims 1, 16 and 24 have been amended to overcome 112 rejection
- B) Does not teaches Allocating the bandwidth according to the rating survey
- C) Program information screen of Ellis is not the same as nd has nothing to do with " matching the content and the subscription information to form an aggregate content bit for the plurality of network nodes"
- D) does not teaches creating a rating survey via the subscription information, the rating survey to maximize allocation of bandwidth, the rating survery including.... user contributed observaction see Remark Page 12

Reposnse to A, Examiner disagrees with applicant's argument A. Applicant's propose amendment still unclear of one or more of user interest level raing content, user timeing preferences receiving, and observational profile or one of more of each user interest level raing to content (see Final Office Action page 4). In addition, it is unclear the first "one or more of" in claim 1 line 10, whether is one or more of all the limitations, which one of user interest level relating to content (Rate rating) will meet this limitation. See Final Office Action Page 7

Response to B, Examiner disagrees with applicant's argument B. Applicant addresses out Alessi's rate converter that relies on a weight based priority scheme and the protocol-independent error-control system that includes server compoenets that assist in providing more reliable data transmission between endpoints. Alessi's does show rate converter is relies on weight based priority (Every user giving weight priority same as giving rating survey to allocating bandwidth) see Final Office Action Page 8

Response to C, Examiner disagrees with applicant's argument C. Matching the content and the subscription information can be interpreted as user subscribe for content information and the similar to the selected program or displays a list of attributes of the selected program

Response to D, Exmaner disagrees with applicant's argument D. Ellis does teache creating rating survey related to the user interest level relating to the content (Rate rating are being allows the user to rate this collected for this program, and to send that rating program see Ellis (III) 128) see Final Office Action Pace 7.